

Koch, Kristine

From: GAINER Tom <GAINER.Tom@deq.state.or.us>
Sent: Thursday, April 10, 2014 2:05 PM
To: Sheldrake, Sean; Koch, Kristine
Cc: Susan Penoyar (PenoyarSJ@cdmsmith.com); JOHNSON Keith; PARRETT Kevin; MCCLINCY Matt
Subject: RE: Principle Threat Material Memo
Importance: High

Sean and Kristine-

DEQ reviewed the PTM Memo transmitted below and has the following comments. If EPA disagrees with a DEQ comment or does not intend to incorporate a response into a revised Memo, DEQ requests a response in writing. DEQ expects that for significant issues such as PTM, our comments will be considered prior to EPA transmitting the document to the LWG.

1. The memo identifies the lines of evidence EPA is using to indicate the presence of NAPL including:
 - Visual observation of NAPL
 - Sheen
 - Odors with corresponding OVM readings
 - TZW and in-river groundwater concentrations exceeding the 1% solubility limit
 - Estimated sediment concentration that would exceed the contaminants corresponding theoretical solubility limits in pore water

The memo also highlights the presence (Figure 1) of “substantial product” in sediment off of the Gasco site and makes a point of clarifying that substantial product is not present off of the U.S. Moorings site. The memo leaves the reader with the impression that the only NAPL PTM off of Gasco is material that meets the AOC definition of substantial product. DEQ’s perspective is that substantial product is a Gasco-specific term developed for purposes of supporting EE/CA planning. Substantial product is a subarea contained within an area of NAPL PTM identified based on the lines of evidence cited in the memorandum. The memo should be edited to reflect that the substantial product identified in Figure 1 is a subarea of the NAPL PTM off of Gasco.

2. If it is EPA’s intent to limit the Gasco NAPL PTM to the EE/CA negotiated substantial product definition, DEQ notes that the other PTM NAPL areas identified in the memo would not meet this definition. As well, it is DEQ’s understanding that EPA as part of the Arkema EE/CA negotiations agreed not to apply the PTM concept to Arkema sediments.
3. DEQ notes that the sheen/odor/OVM, transition zone water and groundwater lines of evidence between the two downstream docks off the Arkema site (Figure 2) likely reflect the presence of observed NAPL in the adjacent upland rather than sediment. In other words, the impacts are the result of contaminant migration from the NAPL immediately upgradient in the uplands.
4. Additional figures should be developed to identify potential NAPL areas based on all of the lines of evidence identified in the memo.
5. Section Recommended Approach, Principal Threat Waste, Number 3, Page 3: Since EPA, in the memo, appears to be limiting the high concentration threshold to a 1000 times multiplier of human health cancer end point PRGs, it is suggested that the this criteria be edited to reflect these values rather than “the lowest sediment PRGS.”
6. Determination of high concentration PTW should include a weight-of-evidence approach based on magnitude of exceedance, aerial extent of exceedance, corroborating nearby or co-located samples and other relevant information that would help determine whether or not the sample is an outlier. For example, one isolated sample that slightly exceeds the high concentration PTW threshold should not necessarily result in a PTW, just as a single bleb in a sediment core would not necessarily constitute a NAPL-based PTW. Using this approach the high concentration PTW at the upriver end of the McCormick & Baxter sediment would screen out. Other areas should be reevaluated as well.

7. Table 2 should include a summary of areas that exceed the highly concentrated PTW thresholds and present lines of evidence supporting or refuting the high concentration PTW determination as identified in the previous comment.

We look forward to working through PTM definition and its incorporation into the revised FS. Please contact me if you have questions.

Thanks-
Tom Gainer
DEQ PH PM

From: Sheldrake, Sean [mailto:sheldrake.sean@epa.gov]

Sent: Friday, April 04, 2014 1:40 PM

To: LIVERMAN Alex; allenmc@cdm.com; audiehuber@ctuir.com; BAYUK Dana; SCHWARZ Bob; brandy.humphreys@grandronde.org; callie@ridolfi.com; Conley, Alanna; Cora, Lori; cunninghame@gorge.net; HAFLEY Dan; erin.madden@gmail.com; Fuentes, Rene; Gail Fricano (gfricano@indecon.com); Genevieve Angle (Genevieve.Angle@noaa.gov); Humphrey, Chip; jd@williamsjohnsonlaw.com; Jen Kassakian (jkassakian@indecon.com); Jeremy_Buck@fws.gov; JOHNSON Keith; jweis@hk-law.com; Kristin Callahan; Koch, Kristine; Lance Peterson (PetersonLE@cdmsmith.com); matt@williamsjohnsonlaw.com; MCCLINCY Matt; tosm@yakamafish-nsn.gov; Michael.karnosh@grandronde.org; Muza, Richard; nancy.munn@noaa.gov; PETERSON Jenn L; POULSEN Mike; Rachel DelVecchio (rdelvecchio@indecon.com); Robert.Neely@noaa.gov; rose@yakamafish-nsn.gov; Susan Penoyar (PenoyarSJ@cdmsmith.com); ted_buerger@fws.gov; tomd@ctsi.nsn.us; GAINER Tom

Cc: Ells, Steve; Fonseca, Silvina

Subject: Principle Threat Material Memo

Hello everyone,

As discussed on our last TCT teleconference, please see the attached PTM memo for usage in the Tuesday April 15 meeting with LWG. Kristine and I would ask for your input on the memo on a short timeframe—by next Wednesday such that we can prepare for final logistics for the meeting.

An associated component that we'll develop soon is the element of practicability/accessibility issues that we'll be putting together as a companion framework to guide how FS costing will proceed in the short term and the steps required for how design might proceed in the future.

Thanks and have a good weekend.

S

Sean Sheldrake, Unit Diving Officer, RPM
EPA Region 10, 1200 Sixth Ave., Suite 900
Seattle, WA 98101
206.553.1220 desk
206.225.6528 cell

<http://yosemite.epa.gov/r10/cleanup.nsf/sites/ptldharbor>

<http://www.epa.gov/region10/dive/>

Like us on Facebook! <https://www.facebook.com/EPADivers>